DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 372 040 SP 035 326

AUTHOR Page, Fred M.; And Others
TITLE Redefining Student Teaching Supervision Responsibilities.
PUB DATE Apr 94
NOTE 53p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 4-8, 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; Cooperating Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Models; *Nontraditional Education; Student Teacher Attitudes; Student Teacher Evaluation; Student Teacher Supervisors; *Student Teaching; *Supervisory Methods; Teacher Education Programs; *Traditionalism
IDENTIFIERS *Preservice Teachers

ABSTRACT

For many preservice teachers, student teaching is the culminating and paramount experience in their preparation to The purpose of this study was twofold: first, to determine the effectiveness of an alternative student teaching supervision model by on-site supervision by the supervising teacher (the university supervisor does not visit the setting); second, student teachers in the site-based model are compared with those working within a traditional framework--student teachers assigned to a supervising teacher and having periodic visits by a university supervisor. Two survey instruments were constructed to analyze student teacher performance. Stages of development incorporated significant input from student teachers, supervising teachers, and university supervisors. Results from both groups supported the site-based design as a supervision option. It is cost efficient, empowers the supervising teacher, and serves as a stress reducer for the student teacher. Its existence, however, is perceived as an alternative, not a sole approach to student teacher supervision. Copies of the survey instruments, statistical tables, a student teacher reaction form, and a student teacher evaluation form are appended. (Author/LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 372 040

REDEFINING STUDENT TEACHING SUPERVISION RESPONSIBILITIES

Presented By

Fred M. Page, Jr.
Georgia Southern University

Jane A. Page
Georgia Southern University

Robert Warkentin
Georgia Southern University

Tom Dickinson
Indiana State University

American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting
New Orleans, Louisiana

April 5, 1994
8:45 a.m. - 9:25 a.m.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

F. M. Page, Jr.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP035326

ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE
GEORGIA SOUTHERN
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY
LANDRUM BOX 8133
STATESBORO, GEORGIA 30460-8133
TELEPHONE 912/681-5247

REDEFINING STUDENT TEACHING SUPERVISION RESPONSIBILITIES

Abstract

For many preservice teachers, student teaching is the culminating and paramount experience in their preparation to teach. There were two primary objectives in this research study on student teaching. First, the study was enacted to determine the effectiveness of an alternative supervision model, referred to as site-based. In this format, on-site supervision is conducted by the supervising teacher; the university supervisor does not visit the setting. Second, the study was conducted to generate comparisons between student teachers in the site-based model with those working in the traditional framework. The traditional scheme involves a student teacher being assigned to a supervising teacher and having periodic visits by a university supervisor.

Input from both groups of student teachers and supervising teachers (site-based and traditional) clearly supports the site-based design as a supervision option. It is cost efficient, empowers the supervising teacher, and serves as a stress reducer for the student teacher. Its existence, however, is an alternative and not perceived as the only way to approach student teaching supervision.

A UNIT OF THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA • AFFIRMATIVE ACTION / EQUAL OPPORTUNITY INSTITUTION

REDEFINING STUDENT TEACHING SUPERVISION RESPONSIBILITIES

OBJECTIVES

There were two primary objectives for this research study. First, the study was enacted to determine the effectiveness of an alternative supervision model in student teaching; this approach is referred to as site-based supervision. In this approach, on-site supervision is conducted by the supervising teacher; the university supervisor does not visit the setting. Second, the study was conducted to generate comparisons between student teachers in this site-based model and those working within a traditional framework. The traditional scheme involved a student teacher being assigned to a supervising teacher and having periodic visits by a university supervisor.

PERSPECTIVE

For many preservice teachers, student teaching is the culminating and paramount experience in the preparation to teach. The value of this opportunity is underscored in Conant's (1963) claim that the only indisputably essential element in professional education is practice teaching.

McNaughton, Jones, and Rogus (1978) categorize five different models of student teaching supervision. The traditional model, according to Anderson (1992), is clearly the most employed method. In this approach, the university supervisor observes student teachers and consults with supervising teachers. However, the Holmes Group and other reformists have suggested a model which empowers these classroom teachers who serve in a supervisory capacity

for student teachers. The influence of supervising teachers is well documented: Yee (1969), Karmos (1977), and Emans (1983). Richardson-Koehler (1988) further proposes that the supervising teacher seems to be the most influential element in student teaching. Given this set of conditions, Scholl (1990) claims that we cannot expect to improve the quality of the student teaching experience until we improve the level of expertise of the supervising teachers with whom student teachers work.

A cloud seems to loom over the supervision component of student teaching. The discrepancy between university supervisors' and supervising teachers' perspectives of role responsibilities has led some critics to doubt that traditional practices of student teaching are effective (Evertson, Howley, and Zlotnik, 1984). The university supervisor exerts less influence on student teachers. Some have suggested elimination of this role (Wood 1989, Zahorik 1988). It is the position of this study, however, to redefine and enhance both roles: the supervising teacher's and the university supervisor's.

DATA SOURCE AND METHODS

The setting for this study is Georgia Southern, a regional university. For the 1993-94 academic year it will have served 520 student teachers. During Fall Quarter, there were 125 student teachers, representing the range of certification fields offered by the institution. From the total population, 101 were assigned to the traditional supervision model; 24 were assigned to the site-based design.

Two factors served as catalysts for trying a different approach. One was a programmatic question. Is there a more efficient and effective approach than the traditional model? Second,

there was a budget-driven consideration. The institution served 215 student teachers in 1989, 520 in 1994, and 600 are projected for 1995. Is there a more cost-effective strategy for serving this dramatically increasing number of student teachers?

A range of roles and individuals participated in the framing of this site-based component: university supervisors, supervising teachers, principals, and superintendents. Participants agreed on criteria for selection of supervising teachers. First, the teacher must possess state endorsement for student teaching supervision. Second, the teacher must have a strong, productive background of preservice supervision experiences. Third, the teacher must demonstrate a keen interest for participation in a non-traditional supervision approach. Finally, the teacher must have a record of instructional excellence.

In the site-based model, the supervising teacher was responsible for all school-based supervision features. The university supervisor (one for the 24 student teachers) did not visit the school unless invited to do so because of a given circumstance or condition. Responsibility of grade recommendation for the experience (satisfactory or unsatisfactory) resided with the supervising teacher.

The university supervisor was a key, rather than a reduced, entity. On three different occasions, this individual hosted supervising teachers for two hour seminars. At a different time, the university supervisor hosted the 24 student teachers for two hour seminars. Additionally, on a weekly basis, supervising teachers and student teachers mailed the university supervisor log-type reactions to the week's activities (Note: See Appendix pp. 44-49 for examples of questions). Through direct and secondary avenues, the university supervisor had considerable contact with student teachers and supervising teachers.

Meetings with supervising teachers and student teachers were at a university location; university supervisor circuit-riding was eliminated. Supervising teachers received $500 for working with the student teacher. This fee was derived from two sources. In keeping with reimbursement guidelines for holding supervision endorsement, the State Department of Education paid $250. An additional $250 was paid by the university for participation in the program.

One hundred one student teachers participated in a traditional supervision model. The supervising teacher was responsible for supervision on a daily basis. However, on a regularly scheduled basis the university supervisor visited the school for observations and conferences with the student teacher, as well as on-site conferences with the supervising teacher. Responsibility for grade recommendation for the experience (satisfactory or unsatisfactory) was shared by the supervising teacher and university supervisor.

Two survey instruments were constructed to analyze student teacher performance (Appendix pp. 19-25). Stages of development incorporated significant input from student teachers, supervising teachers, and university supervisors. Student teachers completed a 45 item instrument; 40 controlled-choice items and five open-ended ones. Supervising teachers were provided an instrument that featured 34 items; 32 were controlled-choice and two were open-ended. Both instruments focused on: a) student teacher instructional performance; b) influence of supervising teacher; and c) influence of university supervisor. Following a single mail-out, 89 (71%) student teachers returned completed questionnaires to researchers; 105 (84%) supervising teachers returned instruments. From the experimental model, 17 (71%) student teachers and 21 (88%) supervising teachers returned survey instruments. Frequency tabulations,

analysis of variance and qualitative categorization of open-ended questions were utilized for data analysis (Appendix pp. 26-43).

RESULTS

Student Teachers

Our initial consideration will be of student teachers' perception of self. Results indicate that all student teachers, traditional and site-based, had positive perceptions of their experience. As mentioned earlier, the survey instrument contained 40 controlled-choice items. Rating options for 27 of the items were: 1 clearly outstanding; 2 strong; 3 acceptable; 4 needs improvement; 5 unacceptable; 6 not applicable. The other 13 items had statements that could be converted to a similar scale. Of the 40 items, 38 received a very positive rating of less than 2 by the 89 participating student teachers. Two items received a composite rating of more than 2. One was, "Your ability to eliminate or improve unacceptable student behavior." The total mean for that item was 2.17. The other, #33, had to do with conferencing with the supervising teacher. The nature of that item necessitates its individual consideration.

Twenty-seven of the items dealt with specific student teaching skills, whereas 14 related to perceptions of their student teaching situation. Comparisons of the two groups' ratings of the 27 items reveal a more positive perception by traditional student teachers. Of the 40 items, 24 were rated more positively by traditional student teachers, 12 by site-based student teachers, and two received the same rating by both groups.

Between group comparisons on items that were perceived as most difficult offer very similar findings. The five items rated most difficult reveal that four were common to both groups. Items for each group of student teachers are listed in descending order of difficulty.

Traditional

Eliminate or improve unacceptable student behavior.

Evaluate learner productivity.

Provide activities and questions that require different levels of thinking.

Develop written plans for lessons.

Use evaluative information from a given lesson to prepare instructional plan for subsequent lesson.

Site-Based

Eliminate or improve unacceptable student behavior.

Evaluate learner productivity.

Develop written plans for lessons.

Use evaluative information from a given lesson to prepare instructional plan for subsequent lesson.

Provide activities and questions that require different levels of thinking.

Fewer similarities are found in between group comparisons on items which student teachers perceived self as most proficient. One of five ratings appeared in each group's list. Items for the two groups are listed in descending order of difficulty.

Traditional

Your commitment to involvement in the total school program as evidenced by participation in: other (please specify) example: hall/lunchroom duty.

Your punctuality in arriving at school.

Your interactive ability as evidenced by utilization of suggestions.

Your interactive ability as evidenced by acceptance of constructive criticism.

Your interactive ability as evidenced by quality of interaction with other adults (teachers, administrators, staff).

Site-Based

(Note: all five items were within one instrument category.)

Your commitment to involvement in the total school program as evidenced by participation in:

Faculty meetings.

Parent conferences.

Other (please specify) example: hall/lunchroom duty.

PTO meetings.

Department/grade level/team meetings.

Analysis of variance revealed significant differences at the .05 level on two items, both were more positively perceived by the traditional group. These two items were: "Your knowledge of content as evidenced by information that is provided as a supplement to the text;" and "Your interactive ability as evidenced by utilization of suggestions."

As reported in the Perspective section, the role of the supervising teacher is a critical one. The survey instrument had several items that required a rating of some feature of the supervising teacher. Contrary to the usual rating pattern of the general instrument, on these items, site-based perspectives were more positive. Items and ratings follow.

On my instruction, the feedback my supervising teacher provided me was: considerable, some, little, none. Site-based rating was 1.06; traditional was 1.31.

Of what value to you, for structuring effective teaching practices, was the feedback you received on your teaching from your supervising teacher? especially helpful, somewhat helpful, little help, no help. Site-based rating was 1.05; traditional rating was 1.29.

What degree of freedom were you afforded to implement instructional strategies that were different from your supervising teacher's instructional practices? "considerable, some, little, none. Site-based rating was 1.12; traditional rating was 1.25.

Literature findings clearly suggest that the supervising teacher is the difference-maker in student teaching. On survey items related to student teacher interaction with the supervising teacher, this concept received strong validation. Although both groups received strong support, supervising teachers in the site-based model were viewed more positively.

At this point, brief consideration will focus on university supervisor contribution in the student teaching process. At best, referring once again to the Perspective section, university supervisors offer a limited impact on the student teaching process. Four controlled-choice items related to contributions of the university supervisor: Ratings were especially similar with no clear pattern of difference.

Additional consideration of ratings for these items seems to be in order. Ratings indicate a very positive perception of university supervisor contribution to the student teaching process. These positive perceptions of university supervisor participation prompt revisiting a comment in the Perspective section. "Some have suggested elimination of this (university supervisor) role (Wood 1989, Zahorik 1988)." Respondents to this survey instrument clearly suggest positive contributions by that role. Perceptions of both groups, traditional and site-based, were very supportive of university supervisor participation. Elimination? No! Careful focus and follow through? Yes!

Two items offered student teachers an opportunity to summarize their student teaching experience. Responses to these items clearly indicate a very positive experience for both groups. Response choices ranged a-d with a descending 1-4 rating scale for analysis.

"How would you describe the sum total of your student teaching experience?

a. It has clearly and significantly contributed to my readiness to enter the teaching profession.

b. It has contributed somewhat to my readiness to enter the teaching profession.

c. It has contributed very little to my readiness to enter the teaching profession.

d. It has had a negative impact on my readiness to enter the teaching profession.

Traditional and site-based student teachers had a rating of 1.12.

"The primary elements of a student teaching placement are: supervising teacher, students with whom you work, and the general school atmosphere. I feel that my placement has:

a. very positively contributed to my development as a teacher.

b. contributed to my development as a teacher.

c. contributed little to my development as a teacher.

d. had a negative impact on my development as a teacher."

Traditional student teachers had a rating of 1.19 and site-based teachers had a rating of 1.17 (reminder: the lower a rating, the more positive the perception). In considering only the element of the supervising teacher, it could be predicted that site-based settings would be positive; they have been carefully screened. It is especially encouraging to see that both settings were viewed in a particularly positive manner.

In summary, on the overall instrument, traditional student teachers tended to offer more positive ratings. There were exceptions. While the three items related to interacting with the

supervising teacher received a positive rating by both groups, site-based ratings were considerably more positive: 1.06, 1.05, 1.12 to 1.31, 1.29, and 1.25.

It was on items that caused student teachers to consider instructional self that traditional participants tended to offer more positive ratings than site-based. Supervising teachers in the site-based model have had considerable preparation in instructional supervision and evaluation. Is their participation, then, enabling student teachers to more clearly and realistically see instructional self? On the other hand, does the accompanying support system for traditional student teachers tend to enable a more positive instructional self concept?

We must keep in mind that these are perceptions of self. Their importance is significant. For both groups of student teachers, ratings tended to be positive and in similar ranges. From economic and empowerment perspectives, then, there seems to be clear support for site-based continuing as a supervision option.

Supervising Teachers

At this point, our consideration changes from perceptions generated by student teachers to perceptions provided by supervising teachers. Results indicated that supervising teachers positively viewed their student teachers' experience. The survey instrument contained 27 items related to the student teacher's performance. Ratings for the items were: 1 clearly outstanding; 2 strong; 3 acceptable; 4 needs improvement; 5 unacceptable; 6 not applicable. Of the 27 items, 20 received a rating < or = 2. Following is a list of items with the highest (most difficult) total means.

Your student teacher's ability to:

Eliminate or improve unacceptable student behavior.

Provide activities and questions that require different levels of thinking.

Use evaluative information from a given lesson to prepare instructional plan for subsequent lesson.

Develop written plans for lessons.

Construct evaluations that accurately and appropriately reflect that which has been taught.

Comparisons of the two groups' ratings reveal a more positive perception by site-based supervising teachers. Nineteen items were rated more positively by site-based, six by traditional, and two received the same rating by both groups. Though differences existed in ratings, similarities were also clearly evident. Four of five items are common to both groups. Following is a list for both groups of supervising teachers. The lists are of the five items that received the highest (most difficult) rating.

Traditional

Your student teacher's ability to:

Eliminate or improve unacceptable student behavior.

Provide activities and questions that require different levels of thinking.

Use evaluative information from a given lesson to prepare instructional plan for subsequent lesson.

Evaluate learner productivity.

Construct evaluations that accurately and appropriately reflect that which has been taught.

Site-Based

Your student teacher's ability to:

Eliminate or improve unacceptable student behavior.

Use evaluative information from a given lesson to prepare instructional plan for subsequent lesson.

Provide activities and questions that require different levels of thinking.

Develop written plans for lessons.

Construct evaluations that accurately and appropriately reflect that which has been taught.

Our consideration now moves from tasks that were most difficult for student teachers to those at which student teachers were most adapt. There was considerable agreement between groups on items that indicate strongest proficiency (lowest numerical rating). Of the top five items for each group of supervising teacher, four items are common to both groups. A list for each group follows.

Traditional

Your student teacher's commitment to involvement in the total school program as evidenced by participation in:

Other (please specify) example: hall/lunchroom duty.

PTO meetings.

Your student teacher's punctuality in arriving at school.

Your student teacher's commitment to involvement in the total school program as evidenced by participation in department/grade level/team meetings.

Your student teacher's interactive ability as evidenced by acceptance of constructive criticism.

Site-Based

Your student teacher's interactive ability as evidenced by acceptance of constructive criticism.

Your student teacher's commitment to involvement in the total school program as evidenced by participation in:

Faculty meetings.

PTO meetings.

Department/grade level/team meetings.

Your student teacher's punctuality in arriving at school.

Analysis of variance was calculated to determine whether significant differences existed between groups. On no item was there a statistically significant difference between means at the .05 level.

Rating Comparisons: Student Teachers and Supervising Teachers

Up until this point, independent consideration has been rendered student teachers and supervising teachers. Our current focus will be to compare perceptions of those two groups. Likert-type comparisons reveal positive perceptions of the student teaching experience by both categories: student teachers and supervising teachers. Between group comparisons of means indicate similarity in perceptions on items that relate to the student teacher's instructional and professional self.

The student teacher's ability to "eliminate or improve unacceptable student behavior" was perceived as most difficult of all items by both categories of respondents. The five items that were perceived by supervising teachers as most difficult for student teachers (highest numerical rating) are presented in the list that follows.

Supervising Teachers

Eliminate or improve unacceptable student behavior.

Provide activities and questions that require different levels of thinking.

Use evaluative information from a given lesson to prepare instructional plan for subsequent lesson.

Construct evaluations that accurately and appropriately reflect that which has been taught.

Develop written plans for lessons.

Student Teachers

Eliminate or improve unacceptable student behavior.

Evaluate learner productivity.

Develop written plans for lessons.

Use evaluative information from a given lesson to prepare instructional plan for subsequent lesson.

Provide activities and questions that require different levels of thinking.

In looking at the list of items from both categories, it is interesting to note similarities in the item that is unique to each category's list. Although the items are different, both relate to the element of evaluation.

The focus now shifts to positive attributes. Comparisons between student teachers and supervising teachers reveal similarities when considering items that were perceived as most positive (lowest numerical rating). Of the top five perceptions by student teachers and supervising teachers, three items were common to both groups. Lists for each group follow.

Student Teachers

Your punctuality in arriving at school.

Your interactive ability as evidenced by acceptance of constructive criticism.

Your commitment to involvement in the total school program as evidenced by participation in department/grade level/team meetings.

Your interactive ability as evidenced by utilization of suggestions.

Your commitment to involvement in the total school program as evidenced by participation in faculty meetings.

Supervising Teachers

Your student teacher's commitment to involvement in the total school program as evidenced by participation in other (please specify) example: hall/lunchroom duty.

Your student teacher's commitment to involvement in the total school program as evidenced by participation in PTO meetings.

Your student teacher's punctuality in arriving at school.

Your student teacher's commitment to involvement in the total school program as evidenced by participation in department/grade level/team meetings.

Your student teacher's interactive ability as evidenced by acceptance of constructive criticism.

Interviews with Supervising Teachers and Student Teachers

Along with survey data, interviews were conducted with supervising teachers and student teachers who participated in the site-based model. These conferences took place during the experience and following its conclusion. Several points/themes were common in the sharings of both groups.

Visits by the university supervisor tend to generate an unrealistic atmosphere. That individual's presence produces an unknown for students in the classroom. This presence can have a positive or negative impact on the lesson's flow, particularly in regard to student participation and behavior management. The university supervisor brings in a very limited

information base on the students, previous learning, class expectancies, and prior instructional strategies. Each of these, of course, impacts current instruction, as well as other decisions.

Supervising teachers, on the other hand, are privy to previous information. They see the student teacher's teaching on a continuum which enables them to be a more realistic reflector and suggestor.

Some interview comments raised questions. What if there is a supervising teacher/student teacher chemistry or interaction problem? In the absence of an external agent (university supervisor) poor chemistry could have a compounding negative effect. On a different topic, in the site-based program, is the university supervision a realistic employment reference for the student teacher?

The interviews offered clear support for site-based supervision. They also provided information for additional thought and possible modifications.

EDUCATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

The significance of student teaching in teacher preparation has a long documented history. Further, documentation supports that contributions by university supervisors are, at best, very limited. A clearly defined contributing dimension (student teaching), along with a questionable element (university supervisor contributions), seem to result in a problem. Fullan (1990) proposes, "...problems are our friends; but only if you do something about them."

The project around which this report is structured was initiated to enhance the total student teaching experience. If that could happen, perhaps problem elements would become our friends. Though we are in the early stages of development, data seem to suggest that movement is in the expected (hoped for) direction.

In the site-based approach, supervising teachers offered a very positive perception of their interaction with the university supervisor. This relationship is a collegial and nurturing one. Both of these elements have potential for long-range, as well as short-range, impact on student teaching.

The site-based approach also revealed a very strong, contributing relationship between supervising teacher and student teacher. The confidence in this dimension results in a shifting of authority/expertise from the university to local schools, an oft-promoted but infrequently incorporated idea.

Cost for travel and personnel in the site-based program represent significant savings. In a cost-conscious organization, this is a positive feature. However, an effort to escalate further savings could result in proportionally diminishing returns. Quality, not cost, must be the driving force.

The site-based model has been active for three academic quarters at Georgia Southern University. In each subsequent quarter, revisions have been implemented based on findings/feedback from the previous one. While we don't propose to have the answer to all student teaching supervision problems, we do suggest that the site-based model is a very viable supervision option.

APPENDIX

STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
A SURVEY OF STUDENT TEACHERS

Background Information:
For items 1-2, in the space beside each number, write the letter that best represents your response.

_____ 1. What is your current enrollment status at Georgia Southern?
a. undergraduate
b. non-degree, certification seeking
c. M.Ed. (Late Decision
d. Other _____ (Specify)

_____ 2. In what academic field are you seeking certification?
a. Art
b. Early Childhood
c. Exceptional Children
d. Foreign Language
e. Health and PE
f. Middle Grades
g. Music
h. Secondary _____ (Specific academic discipline)
i. Other _____ (Specify)

Three sections follow: Instruction, Content, and Professionalism. In the space provided beside each numeral, write the letter that most clearly depicts your level of competence for that activity.

Rating Scale: 1 = clearly outstanding
2 = strong
3 = acceptable
4 = needs improvement
5 = unacceptable
6 = not applicable

Instruction:
Your ability to:

_____ 3. develop written plans for lessons
_____ 4. implement written plans
_____ 5. evaluate learner productivity
_____ 6. use evaluative information from a given lesson to prepare instructional plan for subsequent lesson
_____ 7. eliminate or improve unacceptable student behavior
_____ 8. orally communicate with students
_____ 9. engage students in learner-centered activities such as cooperative learning
_____ 10. incorporate material that supplements provisions of text
_____ 11. construct evaluations that accurately and appropriately reflect that which has been taught
_____ 12. provide activities and questions that require different levels of thinking

Rating Scale: 1 = clearly outstanding
2 = strong
3 = acceptable
4 = needs improvement
5 = unacceptable
6 = not applicable

Content

Your knowledge of content as evidenced by:

_____ 13. flow of information in dialogue with total class and with individual students
_____ 14. sequencing of information in appropriate order
_____ 15. information that is provided as a supplement to the text

Professionalism

Your punctuality in:

_____ 16. arriving at school
_____ 17. preparing instructional materials
_____ 18. evaluating and returning student work
_____ 19. making student teaching written requirements available to your supervising teacher

Your commitment to involvement in the total school program as evidenced by participation in:

_____ 20. student extra-curricular activities
_____ 21. parent conferences
_____ 22. faculty meetings
_____ 23. department/grade level/team meetings
_____ 24. PTO meetings
_____ 25. other _____ (please specify)

Your interactive ability as evidenced by:

_____ 26. acceptance of constructive criticism
_____ 27. utilization of suggestions
_____ 28. quality of interaction with other adults (teachers, administrators, staff)
_____ 29. presenting self as teacher in working with students at all times

Interacting with your Supervising Teacher:

In the space beside each numeral, write the letter that best represents your response.

_____ 30. On my instruction, the feedback my supervising teacher provided me was:
a. considerable b. some c. little d. none

_____ 31. Of what value to you, for structuring effective teaching practices, was the feedback you received on your teaching from your supervising teacher?
a. especially helpful
b. somewhat helpful
c. little help
d. no help

_____ 32. What degree of freedom were you afforded to implement instructional strategies that were different from your supervising teacher's instructional practices?
a. considerable b. some c. little d. none

_____ 33. In conferences with my supervising teacher,
a. my supervising teacher did most of the talking.
b. I (student teacher) did most of the talking.
c. discussion was a shared responsibility.

_____ 34. The number of conferences my supervising teacher conducted or coordinated was:
a. excessive b. adequate c. too few

For the following items, please offer written information that best describes your response to those items. Elaborate to the extent you choose.

35. What did your supervising teacher do that was particularly beneficial to your student teaching experience?

36. List any suggestions that you would offer your supervising teacher about providing supervision for student teachers.

Interacting with your University Supervisor:
Beside each numeral that follows, write the letter that best represents your response.

_____ 37. Of what value to your entry into the student teaching process was the information your university supervisor offered in the orientation session?
a. especially helpful c. little help
b. somewhat helpful d. no help

_____ 38. Of what value to you, for structuring effective teaching practices, was the feedback you received on your teaching from your university supervisor?
a. especially helpful c. little help
b. somewhat helpful d. no help

_____ 39. In conferences with my university supervisor,
a. my university supervisor did most of the talking.
b. I (student teacher) did most of the talking.
c. discussion was a shared responsibility.

_____ 40. On at least one day during the quarter, university supervisors bring their student teachers together for a seminar/work session. Of what value to you was this activity?
a. especially helpful
b. somewhat helpful
c. little help
d. no help

For the following items, please offer written information that best describes your responses to those items. Elaborate to the extent you choose.

41. What did your university supervisor do that was particularly beneficial to your student teaching experience?

42. List any suggestions that you would offer your university supervisor about providing supervision for student teachers.

Summary

43. How would you describe the sum total of your student teaching experience? Circle the letter that best represents your response.

a. It has clearly and significantly contributed to my readiness to enter the teaching profession.
b. It has contributed somewhat to my readiness to enter the teaching profession.
c. It has contributed very little to my readiness to enter the teaching profession.
d. It has had a negative impact on my readiness to enter the teaching profession.

44. The primary elements of a student teaching placement are: supervising teacher, students with whom you work, and the general school atmosphere. I feel that my placement has:

a. very positively contributed to my development as a teacher.
b. contributed to my development as a teacher.
c. contributed little to my development as a teacher.
d. had a negative impact on my development as a teacher.

45. Offer any other thoughts that you may choose about your student teaching experience.

STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE:
A SURVEY OF SUPERVISING TEACHERS

Background Information:
For items 1-3, circle the letter that best represents your response.

1. In what field of certification do you teach?
   a. Art
   b. Early Childhood
   c. Exceptional Children
   d. Foreign Language
   e. Health and PE
   f. Middle Grades
   g. Music
   h. Secondary _____ (Specific academic discipline)
   i. Other _____ (Specify)

2. Including your current student teacher, with how many student teachers have you worked?
   a. 1
   b. 2-5
   c. 6-10
   d. 11-15
   e. 16-20
   f. more than 20

3. Do you currently hold State endorsement (STS or TSS)?
   a. Yes
   b. No

Considering Your Student Teacher: Three sections with controlled-choice items follow. In the space beside each numeral, write the number (1-6) that most clearly depicts the level of your rating for that item.

Rating Scale: 1 = clearly outstanding
2 = strong
3 = acceptable
4 = needs improvement
5 = unacceptable
6 = not applicable

Instruction:
Your student teacher's ability to:

_____ 4. develop written plans for lessons
_____ 5. implement written plans
_____ 6. evaluate learner productivity
_____ 7. use evaluative information from a given lesson to prepare instructional plan for subsequent lesson
_____ 8. eliminate or improve unacceptable student behavior
_____ 9. orally communicate with students
_____ 10. engage students in learner-centered activities such as cooperative learning
_____ 11. incorporate material that supplements provisions of text
_____ 12. construct evaluations that accurately and appropriately reflect that which has been taught
_____ 13. provide activities and questions that require different levels of thinking

Rating Scale: 1 = clearly outstanding
2 = strong
3 = acceptable
4 = needs improvement
5 = unacceptable
6 = not applicable

Content

Your student teacher's knowledge of content as evidenced by:

_____ 14. flow of information in dialogue with total class and with individual students
_____ 15. sequencing of information in appropriate order
_____ 16. information that is provided as a supplement to the text

Professionalism

Your student teacher's punctuality in:

_____ 17. arriving at school
_____ 18. preparing instructional materials
_____ 19. evaluating and returning student work
_____ 20. making student teacher written requirements available to the supervising teacher

Your student teacher's commitment to involvement in the total school program as evidenced by participation in:

_____ 21. student extra-curricular activities
_____ 22. parent conferences
_____ 23. faculty meetings
_____ 24. department/grade level/team meetings
_____ 25. PTO meetings
_____ 26. Other _____ (please specify)

Your student teacher's interactive ability as evidenced by:

_____ 27. acceptance of constructive criticism
_____ 28. utilization of suggestions
_____ 29. quality of interaction with other adults (teachers, administrators, staff)
_____ 30. presenting self as teacher in working with students at all times

Interacting with your University Supervisor:
In the space beside each numeral, write the letter that best represents your response.

_____ 31. Interacting with my university supervisor was:
- a. very beneficial. My input was solicited. Also, I was offered feedback from that perspective. There seemed to be a collegial relationship.
- b. beneficial. We spent some time in conversation with each of us sharing ideas.
- c. somewhat beneficial. Ideas were shared with me but there was little opportunity for me to share mine.
- d. somewhat beneficial. I was asked to share my ideas but received little information from that person's perspective.
- e. of little benefit. There was a significant lack of communication with the university supervisor.

_____ 32. Following the university supervisor's observation of the student teacher's teaching, the university supervisor conducted a conference with:
- a. the student teacher and also included me in a post-observation conference (may be the same or separate conferences).
- b. the student teacher but I was not involved in a conference following instructional observation.
- c. with me but the student teacher was not included in a conference following instructional observation.
- d. neither the student teacher nor with me.

For the following items, please offer written information that best describes your response to those items. Elaborate to the extent you choose.

33. Discuss any features of interaction with your university supervisor that you feel were particularly beneficial.

34. Identify suggestions that you would offer your university supervisor about working with supervising teachers.

TABLE ONE
Student Teachers
Frequency Totals

	TRADITIONAL	SITE-BASED	TOTAL
n	72 of 101 (71%)	17 of 24 (71%)	89 of 125 (71%)

TABLE TWO
Student Teachers
Current Enrollment Status

	UNDERGRADUATE	NON-DEGREE	M.ED.	OTHER	TOTAL
Trad n	60	12	0	0	72
Site n	15	1	1	0	17
Total n	75	13	1	0	89
%	84	15	1	0	100

Key: Trad for Traditional Student Teacher
Site for Site-Based Student Teacher

TABLE THREE
Student Teachers
Major

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Trad n	1	19	16	1	4	15	0	2	1	3	4	3	1	1	1
Site n	1	9	0	0	1	3	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0
Total n	2	28	16	1	5	18	0	2	1	5	4	3	1	1	1
%	2	32	18	1	6	20	0	2	2	6	4	3	1	1	1

Key:
1 Art
2 ECE
3 EXC
4 For Lang
5 H/PE
6 MG
7 Music
9 Eng
10 Soc Sci
11 Science
12 Bus Ed
13 Ed Tech
14 Trade & Ind
15 Other

Key: Trad for Traditional Student Teacher
Site for Site-Based Student Teacher

TABLE FOUR
Student Teachers' Perceptions of Their Performance Means

	TRADITIONAL	SITE-BASED	TOTAL
Instruction			
3	1.89	2.12	1.93
4	1.76	1.88	1.78
5	1.98	2.00	1.99
6	1.87	2.12	1.92
7	2.09	2.47	2.17
8	1.47	1.76	1.53
9	1.77	2.05	1.83
10	1.76	1.87	1.78
11	1.73	1.94	1.77
12	1.92	1.82	1.91
Content			
13	1.79	2.12	1.85
14	1.72	1.94	1.76
*15	1.75	2.20	1.83
Professionalism			
16	1.32	1.53	1.36
17	1.53	1.53	1.53
18	1.64	1.50	1.62
19	1.59	1.71	1.62
Involvement in Total School Program			
20	1.83	1.91	1.85
21	1.66	1.33	1.53
22	1.47	1.26	1.44

TABLE FOUR (cont'd)

	TRADITIONAL	SITE-BASED	TOTAL
23	1.43	1.26	1.44
24	1.82	1.37	1.75
25	1.15	1.33	1.18
Interactive Ability			
26	1.41	1.38	1.40
*27	1.38	1.69	1.43
28	1.42	1.68	1.47
29	1.43	1.69	1.48
Interacting With Supervising Teacher			
30	1.31	1.06	1.26
31	1.29	1.05	1.24
32	1.25	1.12	1.23
33	2.80	2.76	2.79
34	1.77	1.82	1.78
**			
Interacting With University Supervisor			
37	1.56	1.53	1.55
38	1.56	not applicable	not applicable
39	1.79	1.82	1.82
40	1.76	1.82	1.79
**			
Summary			
43	1.12	1.12	1.12
44	1.19	1.17	1.19

TABLE FOUR (cont'd)

* Significant $p < .05$
** Items 35, 36, 41, and 42 required a narrative response and do not appear on this table.

Rating scale for categories of Instruction, Content, Professionalism, Total School Participation, Interactive Ability: 1 = clearly outstanding; 2 = strong; 3 = acceptable; 4 = needs improvement; and 5 = unacceptable.

Rating scale for categories of Interacting with Supervising Teacher, Interacting with University Supervisor, Summary: See instrument for specific rating options.

TABLE FIVE
Student Teachers' Perceptions
Comparison by Major Means

	K-12	ECE	EXC	MG	SEC	
Instruction						
*3	2.50	1.64	1.87	2.00	2.05	
*4	2.37	1.53	1.87	1.61	1.91	
5	2.13	1.92	1.93	1.77	2.27	
6	2.25	1.92	1.75	1.83	1.94	
7	1.87	2.10	2.18	2.05	2.50	
8	1.62	1.50	1.56	1.33	1.67	
9	2.28	1.64	1.93	1.55	2.11	
10	2.00	1.67	1.62	1.89	1.89	
11	2.12	1.70	1.81	1.72	1.72	
12	2.00	1.78	2.00	1.94	2.00	
Content						
13	2.00	1.82	1.68	1.82	2.05	
14	1.87	1.75	1.87	1.76	1.66	
15	2.20	1.81	1.81	1.88	1.77	
Professionalism						
16	1.62	1.35	1.88	1.33	1.44	
17	1.71	1.53	1.63	1.27	1.66	
18	1.67	1.44	1.64	1.67	1.78	
*19	1.87	1.43	1.50	1.33	2.17	
Involvement In Total School Program						
20	1.60	1.78	1.83	1.77	2.00	
21	2.25	1.45	1.64	1.53	1.69	

TABLE FIVE (cont'd)

	K-12	ECE	EXC	MG	SEC	
*22	2.00	1.15	1.50	1.35	1.58	
*23	2.00	1.22	1.67	1.12	1.67	
24	1.83	1.42	1.66	2.00	2.11	
25	1.33	1.22	1.00	1.00	1.33	
Interactive Ability						
26	1.37	1.29	1.62	1.23	1.55	
27	1.37	1.44	1.62	1.23	1.50	
28	1.50	1.44	1.56	1.29	1.61	
29	1.25	1.37	1.62	1.47	1.67	
Interacting With Supervising Teacher						
30	1.00	1.21	1.41	1.33	1.22	
31	1.00	1.25	1.25	1.33	1.27	
32	1.37	1.21	1.18	1.16	1.27	
33	2.50	2.78	2.75	2.88	2.88	
34	1.87	1.66	1.68	1.77	2.00	
Interacting With University Supervisor						Total
37	1.63	1.54	1.31	1.61	1.67	1.55
**38	1.67	1.63	1.25	1.67	1.60	1.55
**39	3.00	2.47	2.38	2.60	2.67	2.54
40	*1.71	2.00	1.13	2.06	1.82	1.79
Summary						
43	1.12	1.07	1.06	1.05	1.33	1.12
44	1.12	1.14	1.12	1.11	1.44	1.19
**						

TABLE FIVE (cont'd)

* Significant $p < .05$
** Traditional student teacher rating only
***Items 35, 36, 41, 42 required a narrative response and do not appear on this table.

Rating scale for categories of Instruction, Content, Professionalism, Total School Involvement, Interactive Ability: 1 = clearly outstanding; 2 = strong; 3 = acceptable; 4 = needs improvement; and 5 = unacceptable.

Rating scale for category of Interacting with Supervising Teacher, Interacting with University Supervisor and Summary: See instrument for specific rating options.

TABLE SIX
Supervising Teachers
Frequency Totals

	TRADITIONAL	SITE-BASED	TOTAL
n	84 of 101 (83%)	21 of 24 (88%)	105 of 125 (84%)

TABLE SEVEN
Supervising Teachers
Field of Certification

Field of Certification	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	Total
Trad n	1	21	18	1	5	16	1	4	1	5	3	4	2	1	1	84
Site n	1	10	1	0	2	4	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	21
Total n	2	31	19	1	7	20	1	4	1	7	3	4	3	1	1	105
%	2	30	18	1	6	19	1	4	1	6	3	4	3	1	1	100

Key:
1 Art
2 ECE
3 EXC
4 For Lang
5 H/PE
6 MG
7 Music
9 Eng
10 Soc Sci
11 Science
12 Bus Ed
13 Ed Tech
14 Trade & Ind
15 Other

Key: Trad for Traditional Student Teacher
Site for Site-Based Student Teacher

TABLE EIGHT
Supervising Teachers
State Supervision Endorsement

	YES	NO	TOTAL
Trad n	24	60	84
Site n	21	0	21
Total n	45	60	105
%	43	57	100

TABLE NINE
Supervising Teachers
Number of Student Teachers Supervised
(Includes Previous and Current)

	a	b	c	d	e	f	TOTAL
Trad n	28	41	9	1	0	5	84
Site n	0	7	7	5	0	2	21
Total n	28	48	16	6	0	7	105
%	27	45	15	6	0	7	100

Key: a = 1 d = 11-15
b = 2-5 e = 16-20
c = 6-10 f = >20

Key: Trad for Traditional Supervising Teacher
Site for Site-Based Supervising Teacher

TABLE TEN
Supervising Teachers' Perceptions of Student Teachers' Performance
Means

	TRADITIONAL	SITE-BASED	TOTAL
Instruction			
4	2.02	2.14	2.04
5	1.93	2.00	1.94
6	2.05	1.95	2.03
7	2.16	2.20	2.16
8	2.42	2.24	2.38
9	1.91	1.76	1.87
10	2.02	1.90	2.00
11	1.84	1.75	1.82
12	2.03	2.05	2.04
13	2.34	2.19	2.31
Content			
14	1.93	1.86	1.91
15	1.94	2.00	1.95
16	2.00	1.95	1.99
Professionalism			
17	1.57	1.52	1.56
18	1.85	1.85	1.85
19	1.79	1.71	1.78
20	1.78	1.71	1.71
Involvement In Total School Program			
21	1.86	1.84	1.86
22	1.79	1.53	1.75

TABLE TEN (cont'd)

	TRADITIONAL	SITE-BASED	TOTAL
23	1.68	1.45	1.64
24	1.59	1.52	1.58
25	1.55	1.50	1.54
26	1.41	2.00	1.47
Interactive Ability			
27	1.64	1.43	1.60
28	1.62	1.62	1.61
29	1.76	1.71	1.75
30	1.69	1.67	1.68
Interacting With University Supervisor			
31	1.34	not applicable	not applicable
32	1.11	not applicable	not applicable

NOTE: No statistically significant difference between of the means.

Mean on 5 pt. scale: 1 = clearly outstanding
2 = strong
3 = acceptable
4 = needs improvement
5 = unacceptable

Rating scale for category of Interacting with University Supervisor: see instrument for specific rating options. This section, by the way, was rated only by Traditional Supervising Teachers.

TABLE ELEVEN
Supervising Teachers' Perceptions of Student Teachers' Performance
Total Number of Student Teachers With Whom Supervising Teacher Has Worked
Means

# of St. Tch. n =	1 28	2-5 48	6-10 16	11-15 6	>20 7
Instruction					
4	1.93	2.06	2.25	2.00	2.00
5	1.78	1.96	2.12	2.16	1.86
6	1.85	2.06	2.37	2.00	1.71
7	1.96	2.25	2.53	1.83	1.85
8	2.39	2.41	2.37	2.66	1.85
9	1.71	1.97	1.87	1.83	1.86
10	2.03	1.93	2.18	2.16	1.66
11	2.00	1.73	1.93	1.80	1.25
12	1.89	1.97	2.25	2.50	2.14
13	2.25	2.32	2.31	2.50	2.28
Content					
14	1.67	2.08	1.87	2.00	1.71
15	1.92	1.97	1.93	2.16	1.71
16	1.96	2.04	1.93	2.20	1.60
Professionalism					
17	1.53	1.56	1.68	1.33	1.57
18	1.78	1.86	2.12	1.83	1.57
19	1.76	1.71	2.06	1.67	1.71
20	1.60	1.70	2.06	1.83	1.28

TABLE ELEVEN (cont'd)

# of St. Tch. n =	1 28	2-5 48	6-10 16	11-15 6	>20 7
Involvement In Total School Program	1	2-5	6-10	11-15	>20
n =	28	48	16	6	7
21	1.87	1.73	2.20	1.83	1.80
22	1.76	1.68	2.14	1.60	1.00
23	1.75	1.50	1.75	1.66	1.86
24	1.50	1.46	2.00	1.75	1.67
25	1.68	1.35	1.71	2.00	1.67
26					
Interactive Ability					
27	1.57	1.58	1.93	1.33	1.28
28	1.53	1.58	2.06	1.33	1.42
29	1.67	1.72	2.06	1.83	1.42
30	1.57	1.72	1.81	1.83	1.43
Interacting With University Supervisor					
31	1.51	1.22	1.44	2.00	1.00
32	1.14	1.07	1.22	1.00	1.00

Mean on 5 pt. scale: 1 = clearly outstanding
2 = strong
3 = acceptable
4 = needs improvement
5 = unacceptable

Rating scale for category of Interacting with University Supervisor: see instrument for specific rating options. This section, by the way, was rated only by Traditional Supervising Teachers.

TABLE ELEVEN (cont'd)

Note: Comparisons by supervising experience were not a major feature of the study. However, these comparative data are important considerations. This kind of information is significant for university supervisors in their work with supervising teachers on focus and discrimination responsibilities.

TABLE TWELVE
Supervising Teachers' Perceptions
Comparisions by Field of Certification
Means

# of St. Tch. n =	1 28	2-5 48	6-10 16	11-15 6	>20 7
Certification	K-12	ECE	EXC	MG	SEC
Instruction					
4	2.45	1.64	2.21	2.20	2.12
5	2.09	1.54	2.10	2.05	2.16
6	2.00	1.77	2.31	1.90	2.25
7	2.54	1.79	2.26	2.05	2.45
8	2.27	2.09	2.73	2.35	2.54
9	1.91	1.48	1.94	2.00	2.21
11	2.20	1.46	1.87	1.84	2.12
12	2.30	1.74	2.42	1.90	2.12
*13	2.00	1.83	2.52	2.30	2.62
Content					
14	1.81	1.54	2.05	1.95	2.29
15	2.27	1.61	1.94	2.00	2.21
16	2.12	1.64	2.17	1.95	2.29
Professionalism					
*17	2.09	1.32	1.31	1.45	1.92
18	2.00	1.45	1.89	2.00	2.16
19	2.00	1.46	1.94	1.63	2.08
20	1.91	1.45	1.84	1.55	2.00

TABLE TWELVE (cont'd)

# of St. Tch. n =	1 28	2-5 48	6-10 16	11-15 6	>20 7
Certification	K-12	ECE	EXC	MG	SEC
Involvement in Total School Program					
*21	1.56	1.48	1.94	2.06	2.22
22	2.67	1.48	1.94	1.75	1.85
23	2.00	1.38	1.79	1.65	1.68
24	1.80	1.32	1.81	1.50	1.73
25	1.87	1.44	1.50	1.37	1.70
26	1.00	1.50	1.80	1.20	1.16
Interactive Ability					
27	1.54	1.45	1.68	1.60	1.75
28	1.72	1.29	1.63	1.75	1.87
29	2.00	1.48	2.00	1.85	1.70
30	1.63	1.35	1.84	1.90	1.83
University Supervisor/ Interaction/(Traditional Only)					
*31	1.00	1.19	1.11	1.40	1.76
32	1.28	1.04	1.00	1.06	1.24

Mean on 5 pt. scale: 1 = clearly outstanding
2 = strong
3 = acceptable
4 = needs improvement
5 = unacceptable

TABLE TWELVE (cont'd)

Rating scale for category of Interacting with University Supervisor: see instrument for specific rating options. This section, by the way, was rated only by Traditional Supervising Teachers.

Note: Comparisons by supervising experience were not a major feature of the study. However, these comparative data are important considerations. This kind of information is significant for university supervisors in their work with supervising teachers on focus and discrimination responsibilities.

(NOTE: Student teachers respond to these items)

STUDENT TEACHER REACTION
WEEK ONE

Complete the sentence; then, offer support and detail for your response: "This week in the classroom for me was..."

STUDENT TEACHER REACTION
WEEK TWO

What was your biggest project of the week? Comment on its success.

STUDENT TEACHER REACTION
WEEK THREE

Discuss the high point(s) of the week.

Discuss the low point(s) of the week.

STUDENT TEACHER REACTION
WEEK FOUR

Who was your most rewarding student during the week? Discuss your answer; include a description of your relationship with the student.

Which student presented the biggest challenge for you this week? Discuss your answer; include a description of your relationship with the student.

STUDENT TEACHER REACTION
WEEK FIVE

Consider the expectancies of teaching that you had prior to student teaching.

What has been revealed to you about teaching that you had not envisioned before the beginning of this quarter?

What confirmations about teaching have been made for you during this quarter?

STUDENT TEACHER REACTION
WEEK SIX

Talk about specific steps that you have taken during the quarter to improve self as teacher.

STUDENT TEACHER REACTION
WEEK SEVEN

Describe an experience in student teaching that has positively contributed to your development as teacher.

STUDENT TEACHER REACTION
WEEK EIGHT

Consider the topic of behavior management.

Discuss effective methods of managing student behavior that you have observed or used.

In what ways to do teachers sometimes contribute to the development of behavior problems?

STUDENT TEACHER REACTION
WEEK NINE

Your supervising teacher and university supervisor have worked closely with you during this quarter. Discuss their contributions to your growth. Note suggestions that you may have for them in their work with future student teachers.

Supervising Teacher

University Supervisor

STUDENT TEACHER REACTION
WEEK TEN

Anticipate your first year of teaching.

Discuss features of teaching about which you feel most confident.

Discuss features about teaching in which you feel a need to improve.

(NOTE: Supervising Teachers respond to these items)

STUDENT TEACHER EVALUATION
WEEK ONE

Discuss the student teacher's participation in classroom activities.

a) What kinds of involvement with students have been noted?

b) What evidence is there of preparation to begin teaching a particular class/subject?

STUDENT TEACHER EVALUATION
WEEK TWO

Discuss the student teacher's involvement with your students and the level of proficiency with which the student teacher is performing.

STUDENT TEACHER EVALUATION
WEEK THREE

Discuss the student teacher's instruction.

a) knowledge of content

b) involvement of students in the instructional process

c) instructional skills

STUDENT TEACHER EVALUATION
WEEK FOUR

Offer evidence of your student teacher's motivation in teaching.

STUDENT TEACHER EVALUATION
WEEK FIVE

This week represents an approximate mid-point in the student teaching experience. Reflect on your student teacher's activity during the time in your classroom.

a) What features seem to be strong?

b) What recommendations for improvement or growth do you offer?

STUDENT TEACHER EVALUATION
WEEK SIX

Discuss the student teacher's effectiveness with behavior management?

a) What approaches seem to be most challenging?

b) What circumstances seem to be most challenging?

STUDENT TEACHER EVALUATION
WEEK SEVEN

Discuss the student teacher's ability to evaluate student participation and productivity. Consider formal and informal techniques; formative and summative measures.

STUDENT TEACHER EVALUATION
WEEK EIGHT

Discuss your student teacher's participation in the total school program, out-of-class as well as in-class responsibilities.

STUDENT TEACHER EVALUATION
WEEK NINE

Discuss changes in the student teacher that have been observed during the time in your classroom.

STUDENT TEACHER EVALUATION
WEEK TEN

At the conclusion of Week Five you identified positive features of your student teacher and recommendations for improvement or growth. Reflect on those ideas.

a) Name other positive features that may have surfaced.

b) In those areas recommended for improvement/growth, what has been the result?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, D. (1992). A quantitative analysis of student teacher supervision models: Implications for the role of university supervisors. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Orlando, FL. ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 343 862.

Conant, J. (1963). The education of American teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Emans, R. (1983). Implementing the knowledge base; redefining the function of cooperating teachers and college supervisors. Journal of Teacher Education, 34(3), 14-18.

Evertson, C., Howley, W., & Zlotnik, M. (1984). The characteristics of effective teacher education programs: A review of the research. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University, Peabody College. ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 250 314.

Fullan, M. (1993). Change forces. New York: The Falmer Press.

Karmos, A. & Jacko, C. (1977). The role of significant others during the student teaching experience. Journal of Teacher Education, 28(5), 51-55.

McNaughton, R., John, F., & Rogus, J. (1978). Alternative models for revitalizing the school-university partnership. Action in Teacher Education, 1(1), 18-19.

Richardson-Koehler, V. (1988). Barriers to the effective supervision of student teaching: A field study. Journal of Teacher Education, 39(2), 28-34.

Wood, L. (1989). Maximizing the development of student teachers during student teaching. Paper presented at the summer workshop of the Association of Teacher Educators. Tacoma, WA. ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 312 237.

Yee, A. (1969). Do cooperating teachers influence the attitudes of student teachers? Journal of Educational Psychology, 60, 327-32.

Zahorik, J. (1988). The observing conference role of university supervisors. Journal of Teacher Education, 39(2), 9-16.